10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THOMAS E. FRANKOVICH (State Bar No. 074414)
THOMAS E. FRANKOVICH,
A Professional Law Corporation
2806 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94109
Telephone: 415/674-8600
Facsimile: 415/674-9900
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
LES JANKEY
and DISABILITY RIGHTS
ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION,



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PJH

LES JANKEY, an individual; and DISABILITY RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, DEDUCATION, SERVICES:HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation,

Plaintiffs,

SERVICES: HELPING YOU

HELP OTHERS

15 v.

GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL; HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL,

Defendants.

CASE NO.

Civil Rights

2166

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DAMAGES:

1st CAUSE OF ACTION: For Denial of Access by a Public Accommodation in Violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq.)

2nd CAUSE OF ACTION: For Denial of Full and Equal Access in Violation of California Civil Code §§54, 54.1 and 54.3

<u>3rd CAUSE OF ACTION</u>: For Denial of Accessible Sanitary Facilities in Violation of California Health & Safety Code §19955, *et seq.*

4th CAUSE OF ACTION: For Denial of Access to Full and Equal Accommodations, Advantages, Facilities, Privileges and/or Services in Violation of California Civil Code §51, et seq. (The Unruh Civil Rights Act)

DEMAND FOR JURY

- 1 Plaintiffs LES JANKEY, an individual; and DISABILITY RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT,
- 2 EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit
- 3 corporation (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "DREES"), complain of defendants HENRY
- KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST: 4
- 5 BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY
- 6 PARKWAY MOTEL and allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION:

7

- 1. This is a civil rights action for discrimination against persons with physical
- 9 disabilities, of which class plaintiff LES JANKEY and the membership of DREES are members,
- 10 for failure to remove architectural barriers structural in nature at defendants' GEARY
- 11 PARKWAY MOTEL, a place of public accommodation, thereby discriminatorily denying
- 12 plaintiffs and the class of other similarly situated persons with physical disabilities access to, the
- 13 full and equal enjoyment of, opportunity to participate in, and benefit from, the goods, facilities,
- 14 services, and accommodations thereof. Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief and damages pursuant to
- 15 the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq.; California Civil Code
- 16 §§51, 51.5 and 54, et seq.; and California Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq.
- 17 2. Plaintiff LES JANKEY is a person with physical disabilities who, on or about
- 18 March 15, 2008, March 16, 2008, March 17, 2008, March 19, 2008, March 26, 2008, April 16,
- 19 2008 and April 17, 2008, was an invitee, guest, patron, customer at defendants' GEARY
- 20 PARKWAY MOTEL, in the City of San Francisco, California. At said time and place,
- 21 defendants failed to provide proper legal access to the motel, which is a "public accommodation"
- 22 and/or a "public facility" including, but not limited to signage, parking and guest rooms. The
- denial of access was in violation of both federal and California legal requirements, and plaintiff 23
- 24 LES JANKEY suffered violation of his civil rights to full and equal access, and was embarrassed
- and humiliated. 25
- 26 ///
- 27 ///
- 28 ///

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

JURISDICTION AND VENUE:

- 3. **Jurisdiction:** This Court has jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12101, *et seq*. Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, attendant and related causes of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, are also brought under parallel California law, whose goals are closely tied with the ADA, including but not limited to violations of California Civil Code §51, *et seq*. and §54, *et seq*., California Health & Safety Code §19955 *et seq*., including §19959; Title 24 California Building Standards Code.
- 4. **Venue:** Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and is founded on the facts that the real property which is the subject of this action is located at/near 4750 Geary Boulevard, in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, and that plaintiffs' causes of action arose in this county.

PARTIES:

5. Plaintiff LES JANKEY is a "physically handicapped person", a "physically disabled person", and a "person with physical disabilities" (hereinafter the terms "physically disabled", "physically handicapped" and "person with physical disabilities" are used interchangeably, as these words have similar or identical common usage and legal meaning, but the legislative scheme in Part 5.5 of the Health & Safety Code uses the term "physically handicapped persons" and the Unruh Civil Rights Act, §§51, 51.5, 54, 54.1 and 55, and other statutory measures refer to protection of the rights of "physically disabled persons"). Plaintiff LES JANKEY is a "person with physical disabilities", as defined by all applicable California and United States laws. Plaintiff has a congenital deformity of both lower extremities. Plaintiff LES JANKEY requires the use of a wheelchair to travel about in public. Consequently, plaintiff LES JANKEY is a member of that portion of the public whose rights are protected by the provisions of Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq. (entitled "Access to Public Accommodations by Physically Handicapped Persons") and the protections of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, Civil Code §§51 and 51.5 the Disabled Persons Act, Civil Code §54, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq.

Filed 05/14/2008

8

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 6. Plaintiff DISABILITY RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS ("DREES") is a nonprofit (501(c)(3)) organization that works with persons with disabilities to empower them to be independent in American society. DREES accomplishes its goals and purposes through education on disability issues, enforcement of the rights of persons with disabilities, and the provision of services to persons with disabilities, the general public, public agencies and the private business sector. DREES brings this action on behalf of its members, many of whom are persons with physical disabilities and whom have standing in their right to bring this action.
- 7. That members of DREES, like plaintiff LES JANKEY, will or have been guests and invitees at the subject GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, and that the interests of plaintiff DREES in removing architectural barriers at the subject motel advance the purposes of DREES to assure that all public accommodations, including the subject motel, are accessible to independent use by mobility-impaired persons. The relief sought by plaintiff DREES as alleged herein is purely statutory in nature.
- 8. Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL (hereinafter alternatively collectively referred to as "defendants") are the owners and operators, lessors and/or lessees, or agents of the owners, lessors and/or lessees, of the public accommodation known as the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, located at/near 4750 Geary Boulevard, San Francisco, California, or of the building and/or buildings which constitute said public accommodation.
- 9. At all times relevant to this complaint, defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, own and operate in joint venture the subject GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL as a public accommodation. This business is open to the general public and conducts business therein. The business is a "public accommodation" or "public facility" subject to the requirements of

inandicapped accessione and

California Civil Code §§51, 51.5 and 54, et seq., Health and Safety code §19955, et seq., and the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq.

10. At all times relevant to this complaint, defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL are jointly and severally responsible to identify and remove architectural barriers at the subject motel pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations title 28, section 36.201(b), which states in pertinent part:

§ 36.201 General

(b) Landlord and tenant responsibilities. Both the landlord who owns the building that houses a place of public accommodation and the tenant who owns or operates the place of public accommodation are public accommodations subject to the requirements of this part. As between the parties, allocation of responsibility for complying with the obligations of this part may be determined by lease or other contract.

28 CFR §36.201(b)

PRELIMINARY FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 11. The GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, is a motel, located at/near 4750 Geary Boulevard, San Francisco, California. The GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, its signage, parking, guest rooms, and its other facilities are each a "place of public accommodation or facility" subject to the barrier removal requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. On information and belief, each such facility has, since July 1, 1970, undergone "alterations, structural repairs and additions", each of which has subjected the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL and each of its facilities, its signage, parking and guest rooms to disability access requirements per the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), and Title 24 of the California Code of regulations (Title 24).
 - 12. At all times stated herein, plaintiff LES JANKEY was a member of DREES.
- 13. At all times referred to herein and continuing to the present time, defendants, and each of them, advertised, publicized and held out the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL as being handicapped accessible and handicapped usable.

- 14. On or about March 15, 2008, March 16, 2008, March 17, 2008, March 19, 2008, March 26, 2008, April 16, 2008 and April 17, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY was an invitee at the subject GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, for purposes of renting and staying in a room overnight.
- 15. On or about Saturday, March 15, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY telephoned Central Reservations for the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL using their 877 number. This was for a Monday reservation. Plaintiff LES JANKEY was informed that the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL would send him a confirming email within one (1) hour.
- 16. On or about Sunday, March 16, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY telephoned the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL. Plaintiff LES JANKEY spoke to a woman. Plaintiff told her he did not receive a confirming email. Plaintiff LES JANKEY told the lady he needed a handicap accessible room. The spokesperson for GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL told plaintiff in substance, "that a handicap accessible room was not available, because the guy staying in it decided to stay an extra week." Plaintiff LES JANKEY responded in substance, that "a first floor room that was large might work for him." The response in substance was "we couldn't rent you a room because you're in a wheelchair and need the accessible room...it wouldn't be right."
- 17. On or about Monday, March 17, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY had his friend Belinda Pates call the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL on his behalf to secure a reservation for March 19, 2008. Belinda Pates was informed by a woman in substance, "that no rooms were available and that rooms were rented on a first come first serve basis."
- 18. The motel representative contradicted herself indicating that a reservation could be made but that a room could not be guaranteed until arrival, but no rooms were available for Wednesday, April 19, 2008.
- 19. On or about March 26, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY went directly to GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL to secure a room. It was approximately 4:30 p.m.. Plaintiff LES JANKEY inquired about an accessible room and was told that none were available. Plaintiff then asked to see the largest first floor room. Plaintiff LES JANKEY was shown a room with two (2) double beds. However, one (1) bed blocked access to the bathroom. Plaintiff LES JANKEY told the employee that the room would probably work but that the bed needed to be moved a little.

6

8

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25 ///

///

///

///

///

26

27

28

Plaintiff LES JANKEY attempted to move the bed while in his wheelchair and asked the male employee to help him. The male employee refused. Plaintiff LES JANKEY then left.

- 20. On or about April 11, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY made a reservation at GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL.
- 21. On or about April16 and 17, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY rented room number 102 at the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL not only to stay in the city, but to determine if the room was large enough to be made accessible. With great difficulty, plaintiff LES JANKEY while stressing and straining himself was able to use the toilet.
- 22. At said time and place, plaintiff LES JANKEY saw that adjacent to the bathroom was a very large closet space that could be used to create a handicap bathroom.
- 23. On or about April 16, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY attempted to use the shower. Because the shower had an approximately four (4) inch shower pan, plaintiff LES JANKEY could not roll into the shower. Plaintiff needed a shower chair to transfer. Plaintiff LES JANKEY contacted a male employee at the registration counter and asked for a shower chair, stool, five gallon bucket, trash can or anything he could transfer onto. Plaintiff LES JANKEY asked this (multiple times). The man replied: "we're limited." Plaintiff LES JANKEY also asked for a mirror to shave and was told by this man in substance that one was not available. Plaintiff LES JANKEY then saw a workman and the workman brought him a four legged low saw horse that had approximately a one (1) foot wide top. Plaintiff used this to transfer onto with great difficulty.
- 24. On or about April 17, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY once again asked the fellow at the registration counter for a small mirror with which to shave. Again, the man did not provide a usable mirror.

Filed 05/14

	25.	Therefore, at said time(s) and place, plaintiff LES JANKEY, a person with a
disabi	lity, enc	ountered the following inaccessible elements of the subject GEARY PARKWAY
MOT	EL whic	ch constituted architectural barriers and a denial of the proper and legally-required
access	s to a pul	olic accommodation to persons with physical disabilities including, but not limited
to:		

- lack of directional signage to show accessible routes of travel, i.e., a. entrances;
- lack of the requisite number of regular disabled parking stall(s); b.
- lack of disabled van accessible parking stall(s); c.
- lack of handicapped accessible guest room with two beds and bathroom d. within:
- lack of the requisite number of accessible guest rooms by classification; e.
- f. on personal knowledge, information and belief, other public facilities and elements too numerous to list were improperly inaccessible for use by persons with physical disabilities;
- lack of a reservation policy, practice and procedure to "hold" disabled g. guest rooms for persons with disabilities before selling said rooms to the general public; and
- h. Plaintiff is informed and believes defendants lack a policy, practice and procedure of having available guest rooms for persons with disabilities. (Plaintiff seeks the implementation of a policy, practice and procedure that handicapped accessible guest rooms will not be sold unless specifically requested or until all other rooms are sold to the general public to ensure the availability of guest rooms to persons with disabilities.
- At all times stated herein, the existence of architectural barriers at defendants' 26. place of public accommodation evidenced "actual notice" of defendants' intent not to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 either then, now or in the future.

///

///

23

24

16

- 27. As a legal result of defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL's failure to act as a reasonable and prudent public accommodation in identifying, removing or creating architectural barriers, policies, practices and procedures that denied access to plaintiffs and other persons with disabilities, plaintiffs suffered the damages as alleged herein.
- 28. As a legal result of defendants' actions or omissions as stated herein and defendants' denial of access to plaintiff to all or part of the facilities constituting the public accommodations which comprise the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, plaintiff was wrongfully evicted and/or rejected by defendants, and each of them.
- 29. As a further legal result of the actions and failure to act of defendants, and as a 12 | legal result of the failure to provide proper handicapped-accessible public facilities as set forth herein, plaintiffs were denied their civil rights to full and equal access to public facilities. Plaintiff 14 LES JANKEY suffered a loss of his civil rights and his rights as a person with physical disabilities to full and equal access to public facilities.
 - 30. Further, plaintiff LES JANKEY suffered emotional distress, mental distress, mental suffering, mental anguish, which includes, but is not limited to, shame, humiliation, embarrassment, anger, disappointment and worry, expectedly and naturally associated with a person with physical disabilities being denied access, all to his damages as prayed hereinafter in an amount within the jurisdiction of this court. No claim is being made for mental and emotional distress over and above that usually associated with the discrimination and physical injuries claimed, and no expert testimony regarding this usual mental and emotional distress will be presented at trial in support of the claim for damages.
 - Plaintiff LES JANKEY and the membership of DREES were denied their rights to 31. equal access to a public facility by defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, because defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE

9

14

12

17

23

25

26 27

28

///

///

///

- TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL maintained a motel without access for persons with physical disabilities to its facilities, including but not limited to signage, parking, guest rooms, and other public areas as stated herein, and continue to the date of filing this complaint to deny equal access to plaintiffs and other persons with physical disabilities in these and other ways.
- 32. On information and belief, construction alterations carried out by defendants have also triggered access requirements under both California law and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
- 33. Plaintiffs, as described hereinbelow, seek injunctive relief to require the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL to be made accessible to meet the requirements of both California law and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, whichever is more restrictive, so long as defendants operate the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL as a public facility.
- 34. Plaintiffs seek damages for violation of their civil rights on March 15, 2008, March 16, 2008, March 17, 2008, March 19, 2008, March 26, 2008, April 16, 2008 and April 17, 2008 and they seek statutory damages of not less than \$4,000, pursuant to Civil Code §52(a) or alternatively \$1000 pursuant to Civil Code §54.3, for each day after his/her visit that the trier of fact (court/jury) determines was the date that some or all remedial work should have been completed under the standard that the landlord and tenant had an ongoing duty to identify and remove architectural barriers where it was readily achievable to do so, which deterred plaintiff LES JANKEY from returning to the subject public accommodation because of his knowledge and/or belief that neither some or all architectural barriers had been removed and that said premises remains inaccessible to persons with disabilities whether a wheelchair user or otherwise.
- 35. On information and belief, defendants have been negligent in their affirmative duty to identify the architectural barriers complained of herein and negligent in the removal of some or all of said barriers.

5

15

16

17

21

23 24

25

26

- 36. Because of defendants' violations, plaintiffs and other persons with physical disabilities are unable to use public facilities such as those owned and operated by defendants on a "full and equal" basis unless such facility is in compliance with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Civil Code §54.1 and Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq. and other accessibility law as plead herein. Plaintiffs seek an order from this court compelling defendants to make the motel accessible to persons with disabilities.
- 37. On information and belief, defendants have intentionally undertaken to modify and alter existing building(s), and have failed to make them comply with accessibility requirements under the requirements of ADAAG and Title 24. The acts and omission of defendants, and each of them, in failing to provide the required accessible public facilities at the time of plaintiff's visit and injuries, indicate actual and implied malice toward plaintiffs, and despicable conduct carried out by defendants, and each of them, with a willful and conscious disregard for the rights and safety of plaintiffs and other similarly situated persons, and justify a trebling of damages as provided by Civil Code §§52(a) and 54.3, in order to make a more profound example of defendants, and each of them, to other operators of other motels and other public facilities, and to punish defendants and to carry out the purposes of the Civil Code §§ 51, 51.5 and 54.
- 38. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and therefore allege that defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, and each of them, caused the subject building(s) which constitute the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL to be constructed, altered and maintained in such a manner that persons with physical disabilities were denied full and equal access to, within and throughout said building(s) of the motel and were denied full and equal use of said public facilities. Furthermore, on information and belief, defendants have continued to maintain and operate said motel and/or its building(s) in such conditions up to the present time, despite actual and constructive notice to such defendants that the configuration of motel and/or its building(s) is in violation of the civil rights of persons with physical disabilities, such as plaintiff LES JANKEY, the membership of plaintiff DREES and the disability community which DREES serves. Such construction,

13

14 15

21

22

23

24

25 26

28

1 modification, ownership, operation, maintenance and practices of such public facilities are in violation of Civil Code §§51, 51.5 and 54, Health and Safety Code §19955, and the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq.

Document 1

39. On personal knowledge, information and belief, the basis of defendants' actual and constructive notice that the physical configuration of the facilities including, but not limited to. architectural barriers constituting the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL and/or building(s) was in violation of the civil rights of persons with physical disabilities, such as plaintiffs, includes, but is not limited to, communications with invitees and guests, owners of other restaurants, hotels, motels and businesses, notices they obtained from governmental agencies upon modification, improvement, or substantial repair of the subject premises and other properties owned by these defendants, newspaper articles and trade publications regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and other access laws, public service announcements by former U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno between 1993 and 2000, and other similar information. Defendants' failure, under state and federal law, to make the motel accessible is further evidence of defendants' conscious disregard for the rights of plaintiff and other similarly situated persons with disabilities. Despite being informed of such effect on plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities due to the lack of accessible facilities, defendants, and each of them, knowingly and willfully refused to take any steps to rectify the situation and to provide full and equal access for plaintiffs and other persons with physical disabilities to the motel. Said defendants, and each of them, have continued such practices, in conscious disregard for the rights of plaintiffs and other persons with physical disabilities, up to the date of filing of this complaint, and continuing thereon. Defendants had further actual knowledge of the architectural barriers referred to herein by virtue of the demand letter addressed to the defendants and served concurrently with the summons and complaint. Said conduct, with knowledge of the effect it was and is having on plaintiffs and other persons with physical disabilities, constitutes despicable conduct in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of plaintiffs and of other similarly situated persons, justifying the imposition of treble damages per Civil Code §§52 and 54.3.

Filed 05/14/2008

p and the
ld and
ith
ENT,

EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive) (42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq.)

- Plaintiffs replead and incorporate by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the 41. allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 40 of this complaint.
- Pursuant to law, in 1990, the United States Congress made findings per 42 U.S.C. 42. §12101 regarding persons with physical disabilities, finding that laws were needed to more fully protect:

some 43 million Americans with one or more physical or mental disabilities; [that] historically society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities; [that] such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem; [that] the nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals; [and that] the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous.

21 ///

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

27

43. Congress stated as its purpose in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12102): It is the purpose of this act (1) to provide a clear and comprehensive

national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (2) to provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (3) to ensure that the Federal government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in this act on behalf of individuals with disabilities; and (4) to invoke the sweep of Congressional authority, including the power to enforce the 14th Amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day to day by people with disabilities.

- 44. As part of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Public Law 101-336 (hereinafter the "ADA"), Congress passed "Title III - Public Accommodations and Services Operated by Private Entities" (Section 301 42 U.S.C. §12181, et seq.). Among the public accommodations identified for purposes of this title was:
 - PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION The following private entities are considered public accommodations for purposes of this title, if the operations of such entities affect commerce -
 - (A) an inn, hotel, motel, or other place of lodging, except for an establishment located within a building that contains not more than five rooms for rent or hire and that is actually occupied by the proprietor of such establishment as the residence of such proprietor.

42 U.S.C. §12181(7)(A)

45. Pursuant to §302, 42 U.S.C. §12182, "No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation".

/// 23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

///

13

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23 24

27

- 47. The removal of the barriers complained of by plaintiffs as hereinabove alleged was at all times after January 26, 1992 "readily achievable" as to the subject building(s) of GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §12182 (b)(2)(A)(i)-(iv). On information and belief, if the removal of all the barriers complained of herein together was not "readily achievable," the removal of each individual barrier complained of herein was "readily achievable." On information and belief, defendants' failure to remove said barriers was likewise due to discriminatory practices, procedures and eligibility criteria, as defined by 42 U.S.C. §12182 (b)(2)(A)(i) and (ii).
- 48. Per 42 U.S.C. §12181 (9), the term "readily achievable" means "easily accomplishable and able to be carried out without much difficulty or expense." The statute defines relative "expense" in part in relation to the total financial resources of the entities involved. Plaintiffs allege that properly repairing, modifying, or altering each of the items that plaintiffs complain of herein were and are "readily achievable" by the defendants under the standards set forth under §301(9) of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Furthermore, if it was not "readily achievable" for defendants to remove each of such barriers, defendants have failed to make the required services available through alternative methods which were readily achievable.
- 49. On information and belief, construction work on, and modifications of, the subject building(s) of GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL occurred after the compliance date for the Americans with Disabilities Act, January 26, 1992, independently triggering access requirements under Title III of the ADA.
- 50. Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12188, et seq., plaintiffs are entitled to the remedies and procedures set forth in §204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000(a)-3(a), as plaintiffs are being subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability in violation of this title or have reasonable grounds for believing that plaintiffs are about to be subjected to discrimination in violation of §302. Plaintiffs are deterred from returning to or making use of the public facilities complained of herein so long as the premises and defendants' policies bar full and equal use by persons with physical disabilities.

11 12 l

13

14

15

16

17 l

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 51. 42 U.S.C. 12188 (a)(1) states: "Nothing in this section shall require a person with a disability to engage in a futile gesture if such person has actual notice that a person or organization covered by this title does not intend to comply with its provisions". Pursuant to this section, plaintiff LES JANKEY has not attempted to return to defendants' premises since on or about April 17, 2008, but on information and belief, alleges that defendants have continued to violate the law and deny the rights of plaintiffs and of other persons with physical disabilities to access this public accommodation. Pursuant to 42 USC §12188(a)(2), "In cases of violations of §302(b)(2)(A)(iv) . . . injunctive relief shall include an order to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by this title".
- 52. Plaintiffs seek relief pursuant to remedies set forth in §204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000(a)-3(a)), and pursuant to federal regulations adopted to implement the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, including but not limited to an order granting injunctive relief and attorneys' fees. Plaintiffs will seek attorneys' fees conditioned upon being deemed to be the prevailing party.

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray for relief and damages as hereinafter stated.

- II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF FULL AND EQUAL ACCESS IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §§54, 54.1 AND 54.3, ET SEQ. (On Behalf of Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation, and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive) (California Civil Code §§54, 54.1, 54.3, et seq.)
- Plaintiffs replead and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth again herein, the 53. allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 52 of this complaint.

27

28

- 54. At all times relevant to this action, California Civil Code §54 has provided that persons with physical disabilities are not to be discriminated against because of physical handicap or disability. This section provides that:
 - (a) Individuals with disabilities . . . have the same rights as the general public to full and free use of the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, medical facilities, including hospitals, clinics, and physicians' offices, and other public places.
- 55. California Civil Code §54.1 provides that persons with disabilities shall not be denied full and equal access to places of public accommodation or facilities:
 - (a)(1) Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to accommodations, advantages, facilities, medical facilities, including hospitals, clinics, and physicians' offices, and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains, motorbuses, streetcars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of transportation (whether private, public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or otherwise provided), telephone facilities, adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, lodging places, places of public accommodation, amusement or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, or state or federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons.

Civil Code §54.1(a)(1)

- California Civil Code §54.1 further provides that a violation of the Americans with 56. Disabilities Act of 1990 constitutes a violation of section 54.1:
 - (d) A violation of the right of an individual under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) also constitutes a violation of this section, and nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the access of any person in violation of that act.

Civil Code §54.1(d)

57. Plaintiff LES JANKEY and the membership of plaintiff DREES are persons within the meaning of Civil Code §54.1 whose rights have been infringed upon and violated by the defendants, and each of them, as prescribed by Civil Code §§54 and 54.1. Each specific architectural barrier which defendants knowingly and willfully fail and refuse to remove constitutes a separate act in violation of Civil Code §§54 and 54.1. Plaintiffs have been and continue to be denied full and equal access to defendants' GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL. As a

1 legal result, plaintiffs are entitled to seek damages pursuant to a court or jury determination, in 2 ||accordance with California Civil Code §54.3(a) for each day on which they visited or have been deterred from visiting the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL because of their knowledge and belief that the motel is inaccessible to persons with disabilities. California Civil Code §54.3(a) provides:

> Any person or persons, firm or corporation, who denies or interferes with admittance to or enjoyment of the public facilities as specified in Sections 54 and 54.1 or otherwise interferes with the rights of an individual with a disability under Sections 54, 54.1 and 54.2 is liable for each offense for the actual damages and any amount as may be determined by a jury, or the court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the amount of actual damages but in no case less than . . . one thousand dollars (\$1,000) and . . . attorney's fees as may be determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any person denied any of the rights provided in Sections 54, 54.1 and 54.2.

Civil Code §54.3(a)

- 58. On or about March 15, 2008, March 16, 2008, March 17, 2008, March 19, 2008, March 26, 2008, April 16, 2008 and April 17, 2008, plaintiff LES JANKEY suffered violations of Civil Code §§54 and 54.1 in that plaintiff LES JANKEY was denied access to signage, parking, guest rooms and other public facilities as stated herein at the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL and on the basis that plaintiff LES JANKEY was a person with physical disabilities.
- 59. As a result of the denial of equal access to defendants' facilities due to the acts and omissions of defendants, and each of them, in owning, operating and maintaining these subject public facilities, plaintiffs suffered violations of plaintiffs' civil rights, including but not limited to rights under Civil Code §§54, 54.1.
- Further, plaintiff LES JANKEY suffered mental distress, mental suffering, mental 60. anguish, which includes shame, humiliation, embarrassment, frustration, anger, disappointment and worry, all of which are expectedly and naturally associated with a denial of access to a person with physical disabilities, all to plaintiff's damages as hereinafter stated. Defendants' actions and omissions to act constituted discrimination against plaintiff on the sole basis that plaintiffs are persons or an entity that represents persons with physical disabilities and unable, because of the

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

18

20

21

22

24

25

26

architectural barriers created and maintained by the defendants in violation of the subject laws, to use the public facilities hereinabove described on a full and equal basis as other persons.

- 61. Plaintiffs have been damaged by defendants', and each of their, wrongful conduct and seeks the relief that is afforded by Civil Code §§54 and 54.1, 54.3 and 55 for violation of plaintiffs' rights as persons or an entity that represents persons with physical disabilities on or about March 15, 2008, March 16, 2008, March 17, 2008, March 19, 2008, March 26, 2008, April 16, 2008 and April 17, 2008, and on a continuing basis since then, including statutory damages, a trebling of all of actual damages, general and special damages available pursuant to §54.3 of the Civil Code according to proof.
- 62. As a result of defendants', and each of their, acts and omissions in this regard,
 plaintiffs have been required to incur legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce
 plaintiffs' rights and enforce the provisions of the law protecting access for persons with physical
 disabilities and prohibiting discrimination against persons with physical disabilities. Pursuant to
 the provisions of Civil Code §54.3 and §55, plaintiffs therefore will seek recovery in this lawsuit
 for all reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred if deemed the prevailing party. Additionally,
 plaintiffs' lawsuit is intended not only to obtain compensation for damages to plaintiffs, but also
 to compel the defendants to make their facilities accessible to all members of the public with
 disabilities, justifying public interest attorneys' fees, if deemed the prevailing party, pursuant to
 the provisions of §1021.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray for relief and damages as hereinafter stated.

- III. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF ACCESSIBLE SANITARY FACILITIES IN VIOLATION OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §19955, ET. SEQ. (On Behalf of Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive) (Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq.)
- 63. Plaintiffs replead and incorporate by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 62 of this complaint.

23

24

25

26

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

28

Document 1

64. Health & Safety Code §19955 provides in pertinent part:

> The purpose of this part is to insure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Sec. 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code. For the purposes of this part "public accommodation or facilities" means a building, structure, facility, complex, or improved area which is used by the general public and shall include auditoriums, hospitals, theaters, restaurants, hotels, motels, stadiums, and convention centers. When sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients or employees in such accommodations or facilities, they shall be made available for the handicapped.

Filed 05/14/

- 65. Health & Safety Code §19956, which appears in the same chapter as §19955, provides in pertinent part, "accommodations constructed in this state shall conform to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Sec. 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code " Health & Safety Code §19956 was operative July 1, 1970, and is applicable to all public accommodations constructed or altered after that date. On information and belief, portions of the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL and/or of the building(s) were constructed and/or altered after July 1, 1970, and substantial portions of the motel and/or the building(s) had alterations, structural repairs, and/or additions made to such public accommodations after July 1, 1970, thereby requiring said motel and/or building to be subject to the requirements of Part 5.5, \$19955. et seq., of the Health & Safety Code upon such alteration, structural repairs or additions per Health & Safety Code §19959.
- 19 66. Pursuant to the authority delegated by Government Code §4450, et seq., the State Architect promulgated regulations for the enforcement of these provisions. Effective July 1, 1982, Title 24 of the California Building Standards Code adopted the California State Architect's Regulations and these regulations must be complied with as to any alterations and/or modifications of GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL and/or the building(s) occurring after that date. Construction changes occurring prior to this date but after July 1, 1970 triggered access requirements pursuant to the "ASA" requirements, the American Standards Association Specifications, A117.1-1961. On information and belief, at the time of the construction and 26 27 modification of said building, all buildings and facilities covered were required to conform to

11

9

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

25

24

26

27

28

each of the standards and specifications described in the American Standards Association Specifications and/or those contained in Title 24 of the California Building Standards Code.

- 67. Motels such as the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL are "public accommodations or facilities" within the meaning of Health & Safety Code §19955, et seq.
- 68. As a result of the actions and failure to act of defendants, and as a result of the failure to provide proper and legally handicapped-accessible public facilities, plaintiffs were denied plaintiffs' rights to full and equal access to public facilities and suffered a loss of plaintiffs' civil rights and plaintiffs' rights as persons with physical disabilities to full and equal access to public facilities.
- 69. Attorneys' Fees -- As a result of defendants' acts and omissions in this regard, plaintiffs have been required to incur legal expenses and hire attorneys in order to enforce plaintiffs' civil rights and enforce provisions of the law protecting access for the persons with physical disabilities and prohibiting discrimination against the persons with physical disabilities, 14 and to take such action both in plaintiffs' own interests and in order to enforce an important right affecting the public interest. Plaintiffs, therefore, seek in this lawsuit the recovery of all reasonable attorneys' fees incurred, pursuant to the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5. Plaintiffs additionally seek attorneys' fees pursuant to Health & Safety Code §19953 and Civil Code §§54.3 and 55 and/or in the alternative, plaintiffs will seek attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to §204(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 200(a)-3(a)). Plaintiffs will seek attorneys' fees conditioned upon being deemed to be the prevailing party.
 - Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief for an order compelling defendants, and each of 70. them, to make the subject place of public accommodation readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.

Filed 05/14/2008

(Civil Code §51, 51.5)

8

6

10

26

Wherefore, plaintiffs pray for damages and relief as hereinafter stated.

- IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF ACCESS TO FULL AND EQUAL ACCOMMODATIONS, ADVANTAGES, FACILITIES, PRIVILEGES AND/OR SERVICES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §51, ET SEQ. (THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT) (On Behalf of Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS, ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation, and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive)
- 71. Plaintiffs replead and incorporate by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 70 of this complaint.
- 72. Defendants' actions and omissions and failure to act as a reasonable and prudent public accommodation in identifying, removing and/or creating architectural barriers, policies, practices and/or procedures violates §51 of the Civil Code, the Unruh Civil Rights Act. The Unruh Act provides:

This section shall be known, and may be cited, as the Unruh Civil Rights Act.

All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, or disability are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.

This section shall not be construed to confer any right or privilege on a person that is conditioned or limited by law or that is applicable alike to persons of every sex, color, race, religion, ancestry, national origin, or disability.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to require any construction, alteration, repair, structural or otherwise, or modification of any sort whatsoever, beyond that construction, alteration, repair, or modification that is otherwise required by other provisions of law, to any new or existing establishment, facility, building, improvement, or any other structure . . . nor shall anything in this section be construed to augment, restrict, or alter in any way the authority of the State Architect to require construction, alteration, repair, or modifications that the State Architect otherwise possesses pursuant to other . . . laws.

A violation of the right of any individual under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) shall also constitute a violation of this section.

4 | f

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DAMAGES

As the Unruh Act incorporates violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the "intent" of the defendants in not complying with barrier removal is not an issue. Hence, the failure on the parts of defendants, as reasonable and prudent public accommodations, in acting or failing to act to identify and remove barriers can be construed as a "negligent per se" act of defendants, and each of them.

73. The acts and omissions of defendants stated herein are discriminatory in nature and in violation of Civil Code §51.5:

No business establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against, boycott or blacklist, refuse to buy from, sell to, or trade with any person in this state because of the race, creed, religion, color, national origin, sex, or disability of the person or of the person's partners, members, stockholders, directors, officers, managers, superintendents, agents, employees, business associates, suppliers, or customers.

As used in this section, "person" includes any person, firm association, organization, partnership, business trust, corporation, limited liability company, or company.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to require any construction, alteration, repair, structural or otherwise, or modification of any sort whatsoever, beyond that construction, alteration, repair or modification that is otherwise required by other provisions of law, to any new or existing establishment, facility, building, improvement, or any other structure . . . nor shall anything in this section be construed to augment, restrict or alter in any way the authority of the State Architect to require construction, alteration, repair, or modifications that the State Architect otherwise possesses pursuant to other laws.

74. Defendants' acts and omissions as specified have denied to plaintiffs full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges and services in a business establishment, on the basis of physical disability, in violation of Civil Code §§51 and 51.5, the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Furthermore, pursuant to the 1992 amendment to California Civil Code §51, "A violation of the right of any individual under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) shall also constitute a violation of this section". Plaintiffs accordingly incorporate the entirety of their above cause of action for violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act at §41, et seq., as if repled herein.

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

26 27

28

75. As a legal result of the violation of plaintiff LES JANKEY's civil rights as hereinabove described, plaintiff LES JANKEY has suffered general and statutory damages.

Document 1

76. Further, plaintiff LES JANKEY suffered emotional distress (all to plaintiff's damage according to proof, and incurred reasonable attorneys' fees and costs). Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DREES are entitled to the rights and remedies of §52(a) of the Civil Code, including trebling of actual damages (defined by §52(h) of the Civil Code to mean "special and general damages"), as well as to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as is allowed by statute, according to proof if deemed to be the prevailing party.

PRAYER:

Plaintiffs pray that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

- PRAYER FOR FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF ACCESS BY A PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION IN VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (42 U.S.C. §1 2101, et seg.) (On Behalf of Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT, ÈDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation, and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive) (42 U.S.C. §12101, et seq.)
- For injunctive relief, compelling defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG 1. TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive, to make the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, located at 4750 Geary Street, San Francisco, California, readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, per 42 U.S.C §12181, et seq., and to make reasonable modifications in policies, practice, eligibility criteria and procedures so as to afford full access to the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations being offered.
- 2. For attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, if plaintiffs are deemed the prevailing party; and
 - For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper. 3.

	II. PRAYER FOR SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF FULL AND EQUAL ACCESS IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §§54, 54.1							
2	AND 54.3, ET SEQ. (On Behalf of Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT,							
3	ÈDUCATION, SERVICES:HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation, and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the							
5	CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive) (California Civil Code §§54, 54.1, 54.3, et seq.)							
6	1. For injunctive relief, compelling defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG							
7	TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D.							
8	THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL,							
9	inclusive, to make the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, located at 4750 Geary Street, San							
10	Francisco, California, readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, per state							
11	law.							
12	2. Statutory damages as afforded by Civil Code §54.3 for the date of incident and for							
13	each occasion on which plaintiffs were deterred from returning to the subject public							
14	accommodation.							
15	3. Attorneys' fees pursuant to Civil Code §54.3 and §55 and Code of Civil Procedure							
16	§1021.5, if plaintiffs are deemed the prevailing party;							
17	4. Treble damages pursuant to Civil Code §54.3;							
18	5. For all costs of suit;							
19	6. Prejudgment interest pursuant to Civil Code §3291;							
20	7. Such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.							
21	III. PRAYER FOR SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF FULL AND EQUAL ACCESS IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §§54, 54.1							
22	AND 54.3, <i>ET SEO</i> .							
23	(On Behalf of Plaintiff LES JANKEY, and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST;							
24	BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive),							
25	(California Civil Code §§54, 54.1, 54.3, et seq.)							
	 General and compensatory damages according to proof. 							
26	///							
27								

1 2	IV. PRAYER FOR THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF ACCESSIBLE SANITARY FACILITIES IN VIOLATION OF HEALTH & SAFETY CODE §19955, ET. SEQ.							
3	(On Behalf of Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, SERVICES: HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit							
4	corporation, and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive) (Health & Safety code §19955, et seq.)							
5								
6	1. For injunctive relief, compelling defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG							
7	TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D.							
8	THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL,							
9	inclusive, to make the GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, located at 4750 Geary Street, San							
10	Francisco, California, readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, per state							
11	law.							
12	2. For attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, Civil Code §55,							
13	and/or, alternatively, Health & Safety Code §19953, if plaintiffs are deemed the prevailing party;							
14	3. For all costs of suit;							
15	4. For prejudgment interest pursuant to Civil Code §3291;							
16	5. Such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.							
17	V. PRAYER FOR FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DENIAL OF ACCESS TO FULL AND EQUAL ACCOMMODATIONS, ADVANTAGES, FACILITIES,							
18	PRIVILEGES AND/OR SERVICES IN VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §51, ET SEQ. (THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT)							
19	(On Behalf of Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, SERVICES:HELPING YOU HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit							
20	corporation and Against Defendants HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and							
21	KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL, inclusive) (California Civil Code §§51, 51.5, et seq.)							
22	1. All statutory damages as afforded by Civil Code §52(a) for the date of incident and							
23								
24								
	aggammedation:							
	accommodation;							

22 Dated:

THOMAS E. FRANKOVICH

Attorneys for Plaintiffs LES JANKEY and DISABILITY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT, EDUCATION, SERVICES:HELPING YOU

HELP OTHERS, a California public benefit corporation

28

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25



JS 44 - CAND (Rev. 11647 _filing

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service or pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO.)

the Clerk of Court for the p	ourpose or initiating the civi	ii docket sneet. (TOC HONS ON PAGE TW	0.)						
I.(a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS							
ENFORCEMENT, I	ndividual; and DISABII EDUCATION, SERVIC California public benefi	CES:HELPING	GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL; HENRY KAO-CHUN YANG TRUSTEE of the CHUNG LANG YANG IRREVOCABLE TRUST; BALWANTSINH D. THAKOT, and KIRANSHINH B. THAKOR, individuals dba GEARY PARKWAY MOTEL.							
	ENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAI			individuals dha GFARY PARKWAY MOTEL. COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)						
•	PT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ASES)		NOTE: IN LAND CONDEN	MATION CASES, USE THE INVOLVED.					
Los Angeles Count				San Francisco County						
(C) ATTORNEYS (FIRM) Thomas E. Frankovi	NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELE	PHONE NUMBER)		Unknown ORIGINAL						
	, S.F., CA 94109 (415)	674-8600		ONTONAL						
II. BASIS OF JURIS	DICTION (PLACE AN 'X' IN	ONE BOX ONLY)		ZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN 'X' IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF diversity cases only) AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)						
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		,	-	DEF Incorporated or Pri of Business In T					
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity		Citizer	n of Another State 🔲 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A	rincipal Place □ 5 □ 5				
	Item III)			Citizen or Subject of a □3 □3 Foreign Nation Foreign Country						
IY. ORIGIN	(PLACE AN	"X" IN ONE BOX O	NLY)							
Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Another district (specify)						☐☐ Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment				
V. NATURE OF SU	IT (PLACE AN "X" IN ON	NE BOX ONLY)								
CONTRACT		ORTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY		OTHER STATUTES				
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Med Malprac		ry ctice	☐ 610 Agriculture ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	122 Appeal 28 USC 158 2423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 400 State Reapportionment☐ 410 Antitrust☐ 430 Banks and Banking				
□ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of	320 Assault Libel &	□ 365 Personal Inju Product Liat □ 368 Asbestos Per	oility	☐630 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.				
Judgment 151 Medicare Act	□]330 Federal Employers Liability	0 Federal Employers Injury Product		650 Airline Regs	□820 Copyrights □830 Patent	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Satelite TV ☐ 810 Selective Service				
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl	□340 Marine PERS ONAL PROF □345 Marine Product □370 Other Frauch Liability □371 Truth In Lendi □350 Motor Vehicle □380 Other Person		PERTY ding nal	Safety/Health	□840 Trademark					
Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment				LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	850 Securities/Commodities/				
of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders Suits		Property Dan 385 Property Dam	age	☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt Relations	☑861 HIA (1395ff) ☑862 Black Lung (923)	875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410				
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	□360 Other Personal Injury	Injury Product Liabil		☐730 Labor/Mgmt Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	□ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act				
196 Franchise	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PE	TITIONS	□740 Railway Labor Act □790 Other Labor Litigation	B65 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	893 Environmental Matters				
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	□441 Voting	□510 Motion to Vac		791 Empl.Ret. Inc. Security Act	PEDERAL TAX SUTS	895 Freedom of Information				
220 Foreclosure	☐442 Employment ☐445 Housing				Defendant 871 IRS - Third Party	900 Appeal of Fee				
240 Torts to Land	444 Welfare	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandanus & Other Sivil Rights ☐ 540 Mandanus & Other			26 USC 7609	Equal Access to Justice				
290 All Other Real Property	1445 Amer w/ disab - Empl 1446 Amer w/ disab - Other	11445 Amer W/ disab - Empi				Statutes B90 Other Statutory Actions				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE US CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY)										
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.)										
自由 20 20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	lities Act of 1990 (42 U	J.S.C. 12101 et								
自由 20 20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	100	U.S.C. 12101 et	S A CLASS	ACTION DEMAND \$		y if demanded in complaint: DEMAND: YES □ NO				
VIII. REQUESTED IN	Ittles Act of 1990 (42 U	U.S.C. 12101 et HECK IF THIS IS UNDER F.I	S A CLASS R.C.P. 23 . 3-12 CON	ACTION DEMAND \$	JURY D	r if demanded in complaint:				
VII. REQUESTED IN	Ittles Act of 1990 (42 U	U.S.C. 12101 et CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER F.I ER TO CIVIL L.R. RELATED CASE	S A CLASS R.C.P. 23 . 3-12 CON		JURY D					
VIII. REQUESTED IN VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY IX. DIVISIONAL AS	Itiles Act of 1990 (42 UNICOMPLAINT: COMPLAINT: COMPLAI	U.S.C. 12101 et CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER F.I ER TO CIVIL L.R. RELATED CASE R. 3-2)	S A CLASS R.C.P. 23 . 3-12 CON ".		JURY D					

DUPLICATE

Court Name: U.S. District Court, NDCA Prision: 3 eipt Number: 34611019128 Eshier ID: bucklem Transaction Date: 05/14/2008 Payer Name: thomas e. frankovich

CIVIL FILING FEE
For: les jankey
Case/Party: D-CAN-3-08-CV-002466-001
Amount: \$350.00

CHECK Check/Money Order Num: 10573 Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00 Total Tendered: \$350.00 Change Amt: \$0.00

pjh

Checks and drafts are accepted hject to collections and full dit will only be given when the treck or draft has been accepted by the financial institution on which it was drawn.